

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/786,837	02/25/2004	Kelly Marie Morrison-Gale	2961		
75	90 08/08/2006		EXAMINER		
Kelly M. Morrison-Gale			PATEL, TAJASH D		
19416 Ridgeline Court Strongsville, OH 44136			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3765	3765	
		DATE MAILED: 08/08/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u></u>						
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
- J	10/786,837	MORRISON-GALE, KELLY MARIE				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Tejash D. Patel	3765				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	N. sely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 Ma This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E. 	action is non-final. ice except for formal matters, pro					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1 and 5 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 2-4 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers	election requirement.					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	` '				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa		• •				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ty documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/786,837

Art Unit: 3765

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Intengan (US 4,173,792) in view of New (US 3,735,420). Intengan discloses a necktie (14) including a necktie main body (16) resembling a traditional necktie form having a front, neckband, and rear sections with a necktie knot structure (40) that has a six sided configuration being positioned on the front of the necktie as shown in figure 2. Further, the knot structure is removable with female (60) and male (58) fasteners on opposite face sides thereof as also shown in figure 2. Also, the knot structure resembles an irregular octagonal shape when an imaginary line, parallel to the longest line of the shape is drawn at the midpoint thereof as shown in figure 5. However, Intengan does not show the main body and the knot structure having an octagonal configuration that is reversible.

New discloses a reversible necktie having a main body (3) and a knot structure (9) with the main body having two face sides with each of the face side including two material

pattern sections (10, 11) which resembles approximately one half of a traditional necktie form cut in an angular manner near the centermost portion of a neckband area with a traditional angular seams running near thereof, col. 2, lines 1-20 and as shown in figures 1, 2 and 4. Furthermore, the assembly includes interfacing (8,13) between the material face sides, col. 2, lines 10-20 and as shown in figure 1.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the main body and the knot structure of Intengan being reversible with each side having different pattern sections as taught by New so that the user can easily wear the necktie as required for a particular application or end use thereof. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that the knot structure of Intengan when viewed with New can have any configuration as required for a particular application or end use thereof.

Response to Amendment

3. The arguments filed on May 19, 2006 has been considered. In view of such, a new rejection referring the shape of the knot structure as prompted this office action to be made new-non final and the arguments are moot. Furthermore, it should be noted that the method steps of positioning the knot structures reversibly without removal thereof over the prior art is not claimed.

Art Unit: 3765

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 2-4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tejash Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-4993. The fax phone number for this group is (571) 273-8300.

August 4, 2006

TEJASH PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 4